

C. J. P. M., Arch 1969, M

2/15/69

Dear John (CC Bud, Dick, Gary, Paul),

Your mailings of 2/12, 13 plus one from the good archivist make today's mail of of rich goodies.

It is apparent we now have Frazier in perjury offense and the Archivist and his good assistant Johnson is a blatant lie to suppress some of the evidence. Before rereading your letters (I read them while my wife was shopping), let me go over what I recall.

There was no autopsy authorization in any of the files I examined, I have in writing from the Archivist, replicated, that they have given me everything on the autopsy and they did not supply that, it was not in JFK 1, as he now tells me, and on top of all this you have Bohner's letter saying they do not have it. Now, when I push them on the identification of the file from which they supplied me a copy (as finally they did, with no file identification), and I ask for the identification, they lie and say it was in JFK 1 all the time. Now the copy of which I gave you a copy did not come from that one. Nor does the copy they gave me have the JFK 1 number on it. I'll be enclosing a copy of their letter to me and my response. We have them really nailed on this because instead of going over the JFK files I ordered every page of each of the four, ditto on the Connally files.

And our three-way play on Frazier; Magnifique! He testified, it is my clear recollection, that he took pictures through the comparison microscope. Dick, you may recall, noted the negatives were pasted together. Now you have the pictures proving exactly this. When I told you of this I asked you to note whether you could confirm Dick's observation. I was not in the room with him when he saw this, as I wrote you. If you did, please tell me so in writing for my future writing. If you did not, tell me so and I will go there and note this in particular (and if they now change this it is even worse), so you can have my witnesses to it, for that would be so strong in court. A picture is fine, and it can be introduced by a witness, but the actual description of the antecircumstances by one other than you would be headline-potential. You are parti pris. Now, if by some chance there is evenness in Frazier's testimony on this, that it is even worse, for he will have consciously imposed on the members of the Commission, who just might see their own way out by using a few choice words.

I am just wondering if the best thing would not be to keep totally quiet about this until your trial. Say nothing to the govt, do not include it in your brief (unless your lawyer fears there will be no trial) and call Frazier as a witness, ask him to swear to his WC testimony, produce this evidence in court, and you've got him in either a perjury charge in the Tampa court or a recantation and a perjury in Washington. The government, to its great embarrassment, will not prosecute. It would then be interesting to see what this veteran agent would do, faced with an open and shut perjury rap.

On the Fisk testimony: I understand, as I did not, that you people build up a slush fund by overcharging yourselves on Xeroxings. However, if you dared trust your transcript to the mail, where it can be insured for its full replacement value, Paul, who is among those wanting a copy, can Xerox for 3¢ a page. I think he'd probably be willing to do copies for Dick, Gary and me, and I think he, Gary and I should

go over it carefully, as we would want to also for our own purposes, prior to your trial. I also think Dick should, in addition, on Frasier and Shaneyfelt. While I think this is quite urgent, I also think there is no rush.

Your 8/12: if you want any more than the foregoing and the enclosed current correspondence on the authorization, tell me.

On what I may want to publish, either by inclusion in one of the autopsy books or AGENCY OSWALD, I will not, except for such things as the enclosed pictures, need negatives or glossy prints. I presume these are costly. A clear Xerox or Gestafax, when you have them, as I presume for this, your best will, are okay. Just as they are sharp and fatty black. I would appreciate a copy of the print they gave you showing the screen, for that I'd like to use with the other Frasier stuff in AGENCY O., where I plan to deal with the framing in some detail.

Your 8/13: and I do appreciate Thermofax of testimony, which I could use in addition to Xerox, if you can do that, for I would make the Thermofax up as I analyze, which could save very much time. If there some pages of the new "Autopsy Manual" have the same instructions, sometime I'd appreciate copies of them, but just the pages you called to my attention in the other one.

On Title 41: 10000.004: I have also chosen to interpret those words that way, but to say one "may appeal" is also to say if he does not choose to allow the rejection to stand. However, I think you can, in turn, argue, that if this had been intended it would have been explicitly stated, without the existing ambiguity, and that because it is not stated, the government is reading it the wrong meaning.

My present concentration is on a book-length addition to GOUP. I've just begun to read and correct, so my wife can retype. This will take some time, during which, for a change of pace, I'll be doing other things, like finishing Frasier's testimony. If you have any special interests in that, please let me know. Otherwise, it is only if I spot something relevant to your case that I'll write about it.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg